DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 280 110 CS 505 561

AUTHOR Fulmer, Hal W.
TITLE The Reverend Moses Drury Hoge and the South's Constitutional Apologia for the Civil War.
PUB DATE Nov 86
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (72nd, Chicago, IL, November 13-16, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Historical Materials (060) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Civil War (United States); *Reconstruction Era; Regional Attitudes; Revolutionary War (United States); United States History
IDENTIFIERS *Hoge (Moses Drury); *United States (South); United States Constitution

ABSTRACT

The Reverend Moses Drury Hoge, one-time personal minister to Stonewall Jackson, defended secession as the South's attempt to preserve the Constitution in its original mission while eulogizing Jackson at a ceremony in 1875. Hoge drew upon the historical legacy of the American Revolution to suggest that the colonies had also formed a separate government and "seceded" from Great Britain. According to Hoge, the Constitution not only guaranteed the privilege of secession, but that the salvation of such a holy document demanded the region go to war. Furthermore, he maintained, the justification for the South's entry into civil conflict was a result of its efforts to preserve the principles upon which American political theory was founded. Hoge predicted that the loss of the Constitution, through Northern subversion, would have an impact on the entire nation, and to forestall a state of national emergency, he implored the North to return to a strict reading of the Constitution. Since the South alone possessed the essence of the Constitution, the region could lead the way back to its principles, providing a redemption for the country. But this process had to begin with northern recognition of its constitutional abuses. In light of such postwar rhetorical defiance, the South's separateness for at least a century after Appomattox is more easily understood. (AEW)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED280110

# The Reverend Moses Drury Hoge

# and

# The South's Constitutional Apologia for the Civil War

Hal W. Fulmer
Department of Communication
Mississippi State University
P. O. Drawer PF
Mississippi State, MS 39762

American Studies Committee
Speech Communication Association annual meeting
Chicago, Illinois
1986

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. W. Fulmer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS505561



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The political-theological hybrid rhetoric of the South's clergy bore no fruit in the spring of 1865. Despite their fervent defense of slavery as the essence of a Godly society and their calls for the region to protect such a God-given right through secession, Confederate nationalism was a barren experiment. Not even the most devout of the southern clergy could forestall the Appomattox meeting between Lee and Grant.[1]

Clerical rhetoric in the 19th century South is characterized by its remarkable similarity of invention from one end of the century to the other. Beginning in the 1830s, southern clergy moved from a view that slavery was a necessary social evil to a rhetorical defense of the peculiar institution as the key element of a God-fearing society.[2] In the 1840s, denonimational unity fell victim to regional loyalty as the Baptists and Methodists of the South parted company with their northern cousins over the issue of slavery.[3] In the final frantic years prior to Fort Sumter, southern clergy were powerful legitimizing voices for the need to protect southern rights by seceding. Since the South was truly embodying God's will through its religious faith and social institutions, the clerics reasoned, then surely the God of Battle would carry the region to victory over the atheistic North.[4]

Southern Protestant religion and its spokesmen were a significant rhetorical voice of the prewar years, supporting the political tendencies of the region by cloaking them in

religious discourse. Above all else, the southern religion of the antebellum South was important for its southernness. Historian John Ezell noted that by the outbreak of war, "the average Southern church member had long since ceased to feel a common religious tie with his fellow Northern Christian." For the southerner, the North had become a "land of heresies, infidelities, and supersitutions."[5]

The spring of 1865, however, yielded the bitter fruit of the defeat of God's Chosen People. Whereas the dominant exigencies for the prewar clergy had been the defense of slavery and the advocation of secession, the postwar clerics faced different urgencies. Foremost, there was the problem of social confusion, upheaval, chaos, and guilt. A Mississippi man from this period complained, "Our fields every where lie untilled. Naked chimneys, and charred ruins all over the land mark the spots where happy homes . . . once stood."[6] Samuel Hill defined the task of the Reconstruction Church as an attempt to bring some relief to this social chaos:

> What was most fundamental to the experience of the people was Southernness, not religious faith, truth, or integrity as such. Everything, the unfinished business of the society, the primary issue in their shared memory, the matters of most vital concern, focused upon the legitimation of a Way of Life.[7]

The southern clergy, as interpreters of the Cosmos, faced audiences who required an explanation of why the war was lost and how the region should face the postwar uncertainties. A significant part of this explanation focused on an explanation of the events, resulting in various apologia offered by the

clergy in defense of their region. Continuing the rhetorical stance they had formulated in the antebellum period, the postbellum clerics defended slavery and secession, offered interpretations of why the military conflict was lost, and suggested a view of social relations founded in a strict policy of racial segregation.[8] As Richard Weaver noted in his cultural study of the region, a religiously solid south preceded the politically solid one.[9] Southern clergy were certainly an important fuel for this condition, rarely disagreeing with one another on political issues. For example, a Baptist and Methodist might launch lengthy tirades against the other over the proper amount of water necessary for a Heaven-bound baptism. On the subject of the proper place of a former slave in the southern society, such disagreements were virtually unknown.

The rhetoric of the Southern Church during the postwar years, then, was important for several reasons. First, these pastors were readily acknowledged as the interpreters of God's will for the South and as such, served as important definers of the war loss. Second, these clergy were the same individuals who in 1861 had helped lead the region into the war and with its failure were constrained to offer some explanation of the events. Third, despite their urgings which led to disaste s results, the clergy were never repudiated by their southern audiences. While southern politicians often drew sharp criticism for the region's failures, southern clergy, on the whole, avoided such charges. Finally, the southern clergy employed a variety of media to reach their audiences with their theological and political Gospels.[10]

The southern clergy of Reconstruction remained Old South loyalists and despite Emancipation and Appomattox, continued to take a strong stand for Dixie. These clerics, remaining consistent to their prewar choices, offered a skillfully mixed rhetorical defense which was supported by the two key documents of the region: the inerrant Protestant Bible, representing God's voice, and the United States Constitution, equally devoid of error and representing the will of the Founding Fathers. Both documents were sacred ones for the South, "holy writs" that drew their strength from literal readings of their contents. When used by the clergy to defend the region, the Bible and the Constitution served as scriptural and legal justification for the 19th century South.[11] The southern clergy repeatedly returned to these twin sources in an effort to purify the image and actions of the region and to offer a transcendent view of the chaotic events of Reconstruction.[12]

One such apologia, drawing upon the Constitution, came from a leading southern cleric of the period, Presbyterian Moses Drury Hoge, in one of the more significant orations of the Reconstruction period, the address at the unveiling of the Stonewall Jackson monument in Richmond in 1875. The following sections include a brief background of Hoge and the occasion and analyze Hoge's constitutional apologia for the South as an example of postwar clerical rhetoric. A concluding section discusses the implications of southern clerical constitutional rhetoric of this period.

THE MAN AND THE OCCASION

Moses Drury Hoge was an imposing figure in Virginia religion. According to one biographer,

> When he arose in the pulpit, tall, straight, slender, sinewy, commanding, with something vital and electric in his resolute attitudes and movements, yet singularly deliberate; and with swarthy, grave, intellectual face and almost melancholy eyes, surveyed the people in front of him and then successively on either side before opening his lips, no one needed to be told that there stood a master of assemblies.[13]

He was, in a biographer's words, "emphatically of the tribe of Levi," with both grandfathers, his father, and four uncles all serving as pastors. He was in much demand as speaker, preacher, and invocation deliverer throughout his state and the region. He ran the northern blockade to bring Bibles to southern soldiers, was the chaplain of the Confederate Congress, and served the Confederate general, Stonewall Jackson, as a personal minister and friend. When Jefferson Davis and his cabinet fled Richmond in 1865, Hoge accompanied the group. After the war, he continued his strong stand for the South with ownership and editorship of the partisan journal, The Southern Magazine. He preached the southern Gospel of Evangelical Protestantism and States Rights for over fifty years and was remembered by one who heard him preach as "indeed an imperial rhetorician, with a wonderful wealth of diction, a phenomenal power of description, and a rare felicity of illustration."[14]

The occasion for his address was the unveiling of the statue honoring Stonewall Jackson in Richmond, 1875. The event was

the first of many such epideictic occasions as the South honored its war heroes. Hoge would later claim that this address was the most important one he ever delivered in a long career of speech-making.[15] Virginia had secured a "home rule" government only two years before, throwing aside the Reconstruction government imposed by the victorious North. The election of Hayes and the end of Reconstruction for the region was two years in the future. A crowd estimated at 50,000 individuals was present to hear Hoge and the day's activities honoring Jackson started early and ran late into the afternoon.[16] The speech was widely reprinted in textbooks, newspapers, and magazines.[17] D. H. Hill, another southern rhetor in demand as a speaker throughout the region, commented:

> Dr. Hoge made the mighty effort of his life. He was inspired by the grandeur of the occasion, by the vastness of the audience, and above all, by the greatness of the subject of his eulogy. He impressed all who heard him that he is the most eloquent orator on this continent.[18]

In brief summary, Moses Drury Hoge was a leading religious and rhetorical figure in the South, and the unveiling of the Jackson monument was a significant event for the region.

## HOGE AND THE CONSTITUTION: JUSTIFICATION AND VISION

Hoge's speech was, at one rhetorical level, a tribute to the fallen war hero. The ways in which he chose to eulogize Jackson are interesting interpretations of such key terms as "duty" and "success" and are not without merit for study. However, the eulogy is not the focus of this paper. At another

level, the speech served as a powerful political statement, offered by a southern cleric, defending the South's entry into the civil conflict. This aspect of Hoge's address does require our attention. Using the Constitution for support, Hoge weaved a justification of the war and a vision of order for his southern audiences into the eulogy of Jackson.

Justification

The initial portion of Hoge's constitutional apologia justified the southern attempt at secession. He declared that the South had a historical and legal right to secede.[19] In his opening remarks, Hoge suggested that the southern efforts in 1861 found precedent in the American revolution of 1776. He noted: "In the story of the empires of the earth some crisis often occurs which develops the genius of the era, and impresses an imperishable stamp on the character of the whole people." Here, Hoge had yet to denote which crisis he was considering and the context of the speech suggests the "crisis" was easily recognizable as the one of 1861-65. Hoge continued his similarities by commenting, "The story of that struggle is the most familiar in American annals. After innumerable reverses, and incredible sufferings and sacrifices, our fathers came forth from ordeal victorious." Certainly, Hoge was now discussing the Revolution of 1776, but such terms as "sufferings," "sacrifices," and "fathers" suggested the links between the South in 1875 and the colonies in 1776, with the hope extended that the South, too, would ultimately be "victorious." It appears that Hoge's purpose in drawing

upon the historical legacy of the Revolution was to suggest that the colonies had also formed a separate government and "seceded" from Great Britain.

While southerners were being branded as traitors for their action of secession, they could take comfort in the similar attacks on their forebears. According to Hoge, the revolutionaries of 1776 "were branded by opprobrious names and their revolt denounced as rebellion and treason. . . ."

Ultimately, the Revolution of 1776 was viewed more kindly, even by the British; Hoge noted that "the justice of their cause, and the wisdom, the valor and the determination with which they vindicated it, were quickly recognised and generously acknowledged by the bravest and purest of British soldiers and statesmen. . . ."

Strongly implied in this context of his speech was the suggestion that the South, too, could look forward to a time when their efforts to disrupt the Union might be seen in a positive light. The Cause of 1776, like the Cause of 1861, was guarded by its justice, courage, and righteousness. The outcome of the earlier one implied a similar outcome for the one which followed a century later.

Hoge ended his speech with a similar appeal to the historical right to secession by citing an Old South "Roll Call of Faith."[20] In his final words of the address, he turned to George Washington, Patrick Henry, and Thomas Jefferson, all Virginians, all southerners, and all propagators of a strictly interpreted Constitution. Hoge quoted these national deities' views on the proper relationships between governments

and citizens, again implying that the South had only exercised a necessary privilege in 1861. From Washington, he chose: "religion and morality" are "indespensable supports" for political prosperity. "In vain would man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness. . . ." And yet, according to the clerical rhetoric in the South both prior to and after the conflict, such "subversions" were exactly what the North had attempted.[21] To protect such supports of political life, the South had gone to war. From Jefferson, Hoge continued his defense, citing the Virginian's "essential principles of government": "The support of State governments in all their rights, as the surest bulwarks against anti-republican tendencies; the preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor as the sheet-anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; the supremacy of the civil over military authority. . . ." States rights, the preservation of the "whole" Constitution, and the need for civil authority must have struck a resonant chord in his listeners who had only to look around them to see military governments and the loss of individual rights during Reconstruction. According to Hoge's use of Jefferson, the South had fought for these "essential principles" when the region seceded.

Between his opening use of the Revolution of 1776 and his concluding citations from the Old South's political fathers, Hoge built an argument defending secession as the South's attempt to preserve the Constitution in its original mission.

He argued: "The people of the South maintained, as their fathers maintained before them, that certain principles were essential to the perpetuation of the Union according to its original Constitution." The war was fought, according to Hoge, because "Rather than surrender their convictions, they took up arms to defend them."

According to Hoge, the Constitution not only guaranteed the privilege of secession, but that the salvation of such a holy document demanded the region go to war. In brief summary, the justification for the South's entry into the civil conflict was a result of the region following its historical legacy and from the region's efforts to preserve the principles upon which American political theory was founded.

Vision

Hoge did more than offer a reason or justification for the war. As he suggested: "We have a future to face, and in that future lies not only duty, and trial perhaps, but also hope." To describe such a future, Hoge used the occasion to offer a constitutional interpretation of how the South should act in the postwar years. Here, he employed the Constitution as support for a vision of order for the region.

He began his vision by contrasting the unchanging nature of the original Constitution with such temporal successes as Confederate nationalism. Linked to this immutability was a sense of righteousness in the Southern Cause and served Hoge as a strong argument from principle.[22] He noted: "A form

of government may change, a policy may perish, but a principle can never die.'"[23] Society might change, Hoge admitted, but "these changed conditions of society have not annihilated one original truth."

While the truth of the Constitution might not be susceptible to change, the document could suffer other fates. What the war had wrought, according to Hoge, was the subversion of the very Constitution the South had tried to preserve. "But it is idle to shut our eyes," Hoge said in the final section of his remarks, "to the fact that this consolidated empire of States is not the Union established by our father. No intelligent European student of American institutions is deceived by any such assumptions." The South should not be misled either: "We gain nothing by deceiving ourselves."

The loss of the Constitution, through Northern subversion, would have an impact on the entire nation in Hoge's vision. The confusion of Reconstruction faced by the South was only a portent of a national chaos. Drawing upon the strength of history, Hoge said: "And if history teaches any lesson, it is this, that a nation cannot long survive when the fundamental principles which gave it life, originally, are subverted. It is true, republics have often degenerated into despotisms." Such a transformation has always "absorbed and obliterated the rights of the citizen" leading to "inevitable anarchy, disintegration, and ultimate extinction."

To forestall such a state of national emergency, Hoge implored the North (an absent, though important audience for the speaker) to return to a strict reading of the Constitution.

He reminded his southern audience that they had never abandoned this position:

> If then it be asked how are we to escape the catastrophe, I answer by a voluntary return to the fundamental principles upon which our republic was originally founded. And if it be objected that we have already entered upon one of those political revolutions which never go backward, then I ask, who gave to any one the authority to say so? and whence comes the infallibility which entitles any one to pronounce a judgment so overwhelming?

For both his audiences, southern and northern, he offered a challenge to see the Civil War as a patriotic venture and concluded that such a patriotism was necessary to save the entire country from impending disaster:

> Why may there not be a comprehension of what is truly politic, and what is grandly right, slumbering in the hearts of our American people--a people at once so practical and emotional, so capable of great enterprise and greater magnanimity--a patriotism which is yet to awake and announce itself in a repudiation of all unconstitutional invasion of the liberties of the citizens of any portion of this broad Union?

For Hoge, an evil revolution (Reconstruction) was at work to undo the glories of the Great Revolutions (1776/1861). He again reminded his audience that the future was one of hope and true to Evangelical Protestant upbringing, spoke of a redemption for the South and ultimately the nation. "When we remember," he said

> the awful strain to which the principles of other constitutional governments have been subjected in the excitement of revolutionary epochs, and how, when seemingly submerged by the tempest, they have risen again and re-asserted themselves in their original integrity, why should we despair of seeing the ark of our liberties again resting on the summit of the mount. . . .?

The ark of liberties, for Hoge, was a Constitution strictly interpreted.

Since the South alone possessed the essence of the Constitution of 1782, the region could lead the way back to its principles, providing a redemption for the country.[24] Reconciliation between conquerer and conquered, as well as this national redemption, began with northern recognition of its constitutional abuses. The duty and determination of the South, according to Hoge, was to maintain the Union in the postwar years, but only "if all the States which compose it will unite in making it such a Union as our fathers framed, and in enthroning above it, not a Caesar, but the Constitution, in its old supremacy." Such a time would also be when all the states "stand on the same level," welded together "in one great fraternal, enduring Union."

The South, however, should not honor a government which failed to retain the principles of a strictly interpreted Constitution so jealously guarded by the southerners. In strong language, Hoge called for renewed defiance by the South if the region did not receive constitutional satisfaction from the North:

> . . . . I trust the day will never dawn when the Southern people will add degredation to defeat and hypocrisy to subjugation, by professing a love for the Union which denies to one of their States a single right accorded to Massachusetts or New York--to such a Union we will never be heartily loyal while that bronze hand [of Jackson's monument] grasps its sword--while yonder river chants the requiem of the sixteen thousand Confederate dead who, with Stuart among them, sleep on the hills of Hollywood [a Confederate cemetery].

Hoge finished his vision by suggesting that the return[14] to full constitutional freedom for the South was achieveable, though not yet achieved. "The complete emancipation of our constitutional liberties," he said, "must come from other quarters, but we have our part to perform, one requiring patience, prudence, fortitude, and faith." In addition to these four virtues, continual sectional loyalty might have been added. The principles of the original Constitution could not die for Hoge but might be lost by the South if the region relaxed its vigil in calling for a return to the original intent of the document.

In brief summary, Hoge's constitutional vision of order suggested that a strict interpretation of the Constitution, a return to its intent of 1782, would bring about social order to the South and national redemption for the rest of the country. Until the South enjoyed the constitutional privileges of the halycon days of the early 1800s, reconciliation would be impossible and even dishonorable.

## CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

There are several implications which may be drawn from this significant address delivered by a leading southern orator. First, the speech is an example of discourse functioning as deliberative rhetoric while serving an epideictic occasion. Chaim Perelman has suggested that the goal of ceremonial discourse "is always to strengthen a consensus around certain values which one wants to see prevail and which should orient action in the future."[25] In this address, however, Hoge seemed

to go beyond a discussion of what was socially acceptable to the South by offering continued sectionalism and defiance to his audience as an action "in the future." Further, Hoge seemed to define northern leaders as an important, though implied, audience for these deliberative statements which read as threats to the conquering North. The speech is important as well as an example of continued southern clerical involvement in political issues in the postwar period. The rhetorical stance of these clerics, as exemplified by this speech, remained unchanged despite the war. As the Hoge oration suggests, the clergy made full use of any occasion to offer a rhetoric of continued defiance if southern demands were not met. The speech certainly suggests an aggressive posture by the South toward the North if the North failed to return to original constitutional principles.

This speech also reveals the clerical insistence of the South's right to secession a full decade after the war's end and almost fifteen years after the first shots were fired at Fort Sumter. A contemporary analogy of similar time frame might be those individuals today who defend America's "right" to be involved in Vietnam. The Lost Cause mentality was, above all, a strong one temporally.[26]

This oration was one of a series of <u>apologias</u> offered by the clergy to justify why the South had fought. According to this particular speech, the South had engaged in the conflict to save a holy document, not for regional self-gain, and least of all, for the issue of slavery.

Further, the speech suggested that the South might have lost the military conflict, but the region retained a superiority over their conquerers because the South alone had remained true to the Constitution. In a way, such rhetoric extends the conflict by transforming the battle from one of bullets to one of political discourse and vision. This southern constitutional superiority also created a distance between the two regions, preventing any lasting reconciliation, and maintaining southern sectionalism in thought, if not in deed.

Perhaps the most significant implication of this speech is found in the vagueness of such terms as "original Constitution" and"principles." With southern states returning to home rule during this time period and moving toward a re-drafting of state constitutions, these terms may have well served as code words for Hoge's listeners.[27] In addition to justifying continued sectional ideology, there is the strong promise by Hoge that a return to these terms would be a return to social order. The "principles" of the "original Constitution" may have suggested a way in which to deal with the single greatest social exigence: the presence of eight million former slaves thrust into equality with their former owners. Perhaps such terms, as used by Hoge, suggested a continued need for, and a justification of, segregation in the South. Such a point might well be considered for future research. It is interesting to note that a strict reading of the "original Constitution" certainly favored the prewar South and reduced blacks to the realm of property.

In conclusion, the postwar southern clergy, true to their prewar rhetoric, actively defended the Southern Cause. Their use of the Constitution as a source of proof and justification suggests their unflagging devotion to a past which, with the fighting of the Civil War, no longer existed. The South's postwar rhetorical defiance, led in part by their sacred spokesmen, serves to explain the region's separateness which extended for at least a century after Appomattox.[28]

NOTES

[1] For a general, though dated, statement about the prewar South and its religion, see W. J. Cash, The Mind of the South (1941; New York: Vintage, 1969) 55-60, 81-84.

[2] Avery O. Craven, The Growth of Southern Nationalism: 1848-1861 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1953) 260-4; Anne C. Loveland, Southern Evangelicals and the Social Order: 1800-1860 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1980) 188-218.

[3] H. Shelton Smith, "Debate and Division," In His Image, But. . . .: Racism in Southern Religion, 1780-1910 (Durham: Duke UP, 1972) 74-128.

[4] James W. Silver, Confederate Morale and Church Propagada (Tuscaloosa: Confederate Publishing, 1957).

[5] John S. Ezell, The South Since 1865, 2nd ed. (Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1978) 341-2.

[6] cited in E. Merton Coulter, The South During Reconstruction (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1947) 16.

[7] Samuel S. Hill, Jr., Religion and the Solid South (Nashville: Abingdon, 1972) 43.

[8] For general information on this period and the clergy's activities, see Smith, In His Image 208-257; and Hal W. Fulmer, "The Rhetoric of an Unreconstructed Southern Church: Implications for the Development of a Distinct Culture," Virginia Journal of Communication 5 (1984): 1-12.

[9] Richard M. Weaver, The Southern Tradition at Bay (New Rochelle: Arlington House, 1968) 98-111.

[10] The southern clergy of this time period gave sermons, occasional speeches, public invocations, had their own religious presses, often appeared in the secular presses, and wrote books as well as tracts. For Baptist examples of these various media, see Rufus B. Spain, At Ease in Zion: A Social History of Southern Baptists, 1865-1900 (Nashville: Vanderbilt UP, 1961).

[11] For a discussion of these justifications, see Donald G. Mathews, Religion in the Old South (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1977) 136-184. For a period discussion of these beliefs, see "Southern Views," Southern Presbyterian Review 21 (1870): 61-88.

[12] The theoretical bases for purification and apologia as a rhetorical genre are found in two critical essays: Walter R. Fisher, "A Motive View of Communication," Quarterly Journal of Speech 56 (1970): 131-139; and B. L. Ware and Wil A. Linkugel, "They Spoke in Defense of Themselves: On the Generic Criticism of Apologia," Quarterly Journal of Speech 59 (1973): 273-283.

[13] Walter A. Moore, "Moses Drury Hoge," Library of Southern Literature, E. A. Alderman and J. C. Harris, eds. (Atlanta: Hoyt and Martin, 1907) 2436.

[14] Moore 2435, 2439. For additional information on Hoge, see History of Southern Oratory, Volume IX of The South in the Building of the Nation, Thomas Watson, ed. (Richmond: Southern Historical Publication Society, 1909) 141; John W. Schildt, Jackson and the Preachers(Parsons, West Virginia: McClain, 1982) 120-132; Weaver, Southern Tradition 156-158; and Peyton Hoge, Moses Drury Hoge: Life and Letters (Richmond, 1899).

[15] Henry Alexander White, Southern Presbyterian Leaders (New York: Harper, 1911) 426-445.

[16] For a discussion of the unveiling, see Charles R. Wilson, Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920 (Athens: U of Georgia P, 1980) 18-24.

[17] For this paper, I have used the address as it appears in "Orations at the Unveiling of the Statue of Stonewall Jackson," Southern Magazine 17 (1875): 699-718. For brevity, I have not cited the page number of each individual quotation from the speech.

[18] Schildt 130; originally, Peyton Hoge 275. For another period reaction to the speech, see Mary Anna Jackson, Memoirs of Stonewall Jackson (1895; Dayton: Morningside, 1976)631. Most southern newspapers also carried responses to the address; see, for example, the Atlanta Constitution, 27 October 1875: 2.

[19] For a lengthy and developed clerical view on the legality of secession, see Albert Taylor Bledsoe Is Davis a Traitor? (Baltimore, 1866).

[20] Hoge made an interesting use of this "Roll Call," which has its legacy in the Protestant Bible. See the Book of Hebrews, chapter 12.

[21] For a period discussion of this idea, see Albert Taylor Bledsoe, "Chivalrous Southrons," Southern Review 6 (1869): 96-128.

[22] The argument from principle is, according to Richard Weaver, the strongest form of persuasion. See Richard M. Weaver, "Abraham Lincoln and the Argument from Definition," The Ethics of Rhetoric (South Bend: Regnery, 1953) 85-114.

[23] The use of the term, "principles," is a recurrent one in southern clerical rhetoric of this period, found across denominational lines. See Hal W. Fulmer, "'The End is Not Yet. . . .': Reconstruction Clergy, Southern Principles, and Terministic Screens," presentation at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, Illinois, 1986.

[24] The Messianic theme is also strong in southern clerical reaction to the war; the clergy suggested that the South had sacrificed itself to "save" the Union (or in this case, the Constitution). See William J. Cooper, Liberty and Slavery (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1983) 282-286.

[25] Chaim Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca, The New Rhetoric, trans. Purcell Weaver and John Wilkinson (Notre Dame: UP, 1969) 51.

[26] For an excellent discussion of the Lost Cause mentality and ideology, see Charles R. Wilson, Baptized in Blood: The Religion of the Lost Cause, 1865-1920.

[27] The use of "code words" is not an unusual one, especially in the South. For a discussion of such words as they were used in the Civil Rights era, see Waldo W. Braden, "The Rhetoric of a Closed Society," The Oral Tradition in the South (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1983) 107-124.

[28] For the role of the southern clergy at the close of the 19th century, especially regarding the legalization of segregation, see Rufus B. Spain, At Ease in Zion; and John Lee Eighmy, Churches in Cultural Captivity: A History of the Social Attitudes of Southern Baptists (Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 1972).